

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 2340-00341CF F 07/01/92 RUSSELL . 07/907.483 **EXAMINER** RAMIREZ TORRES,R HARNESS, DICKEY AND PIERCE P.O. BOX 828 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303 3505 02/03/93 DATE MAILED: This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS This application has been examined ___ month(s), 30 days from the date of this letter. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire..... Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: Part I 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1448. 4. D Notice of informal Patent Application; Form PTO-152. 5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. 6. 🗆 ___ **SUMMARY OF ACTION** Claims _ are pending in the application. Of the above, claims 2. Claims_ have been cancelled. 3. Claims_ 5. Claims __ are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. 🔲 This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. . . . 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _ __. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable. not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948). 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _______ has (have) been approved by the examiner.

disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). _____, has been 🔲 approved. 🔲 disapproved (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed on ____ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has 🚨 been received: 🔲 riot been received been filed in parent application, serial no. 27/607 448; filed on 10/51/90 13.

Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. 14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

PTOL-326 (Rev. 9-89)

Serial No. 07/907483

Art Unit 3505

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: the species illustrated in Fig. 1, the species illustrated in Figs. 2 - 4, the species illustrated in Figs. 5 and 6, the species illustrated in Figs. 7 and 8, the species illustrated in Figs. 9 and 10, the species illustrated in Figs. 11 - 13, the species illustrated in Figs. 14 and 15, the species illustrated in Figs. 17 -19, and the species illustrated in Figs. 20 - 22.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 appears to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

Serial No. 07/907483

Art Unit 3505

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Ramirez at telephone number (703) 308-2168.

R.O.RAMIREZ February 01, 1993

> RAMON O. RAMIREZ PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 355